



## REMARKS

Claims 1-74 were pending in the present application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6, 9-18, 23-37, 39-41, 44-50, 55-59, and 61-74. Claims 1-74 are once again presented and considered to be in condition for allowance.

In light of the remarks provided below, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims as currently presented is respectfully requested.

**§102 Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 23, 30, 33-38, 40, 45-50, 55, 62, 63, and 65-74**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-11, 23, 30, 33-38, 40, 45-50, 55, 62, 63, and 65-74 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by *Agre*. The Examiner has indicated that *Agre* discloses "receiving signals over the second air interface from the second base station" and points to col. 5, lines 31-36. Applicants respectfully wish to point out to the Examiner that this portion of *Agre* discloses a system in which a CDMA signal (i.e., a pilot signal from either a CDMA base station or a pilot from a beacon) is received. In either case, the subscriber is receiving signals **of the same type**. In contrast, the invention of Claim 1 requires that the subscriber receive signals from a second base station **over a second air interface**, the second air interface **which is of a second type** distinct from the first type. As noted previously, this distinction is very important, since the subscriber will typically have only one receiver and must cease receiving signals of the first type in order to receive signals of the second type. Furthermore, the system disclosed by *Agre* **requires a CDMA beacon to be transmitted in association with GSM base stations** in order to allow the subscriber to determine the likelihood that the GSM signals will be acceptable. Accordingly, the GSM base stations must be modified, or a separate CDMA pilot transmitter must be deployed, causing a relatively large expense to be incurred by the GSM operators. In contrast, the invention of Claim 1 does not require any such modification of the GSM base stations or deployment of additional equipment.

It should be noted that Claims 2-34 each depend from Claim 1 and therefore, include this limitation, which is neither taught nor suggested by *Agre*. Furthermore, Claim 35 also includes a similar limitation, in that Claim 34 requires that signals be received "from the first and second cells over the first and second air interfaces, respectively". Claims 36 – 66 each depend from Claim 35, and therefore are patentable over *Agre* for the same reasons provided with respect to Claim 1.

As noted previously, with regard to Claim 67 and those claims that depend therefrom, a limitation is presented which requires "determining a characteristic of the signals, **responsive to the determined location area of the second cell**". It

should be noted that nothing in the cited references teaches or suggests this limitation.

Furthermore, with regard to Claim 71 and the claims that depend therefrom, a similar limitation is recited.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of each of the claims presently before the Examiner.

In addition, Applicants wish to take issue with the Examiner's "official notice" that use of desired interfacing protocol layers are well known in the art. Accordingly, if this remains at issue, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide a reference illustrating this fact.


**§103 Rejection of Claims 4, 24-27, 29, 32, 39, 57-59, 61, and 64**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 24-27, 29, 32, 39, 57-59, 61, and 64 as being unpatentable over Agre. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections under §103 for the reasons stated above.

In light of the foregoing, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application with a view toward allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if a telephone call could help solve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2001

By:   
Bruce W. Greenhaus  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,339

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 651-6399  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502